

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on June 26, 2008, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 8 are amended. With no claims being deleted or added, Claims 1-10 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

The Final Office action rejects claims 1-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Berkner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,239,424). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. For reasons explained below, the claims in question are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over the cited reference.

Berkner et al. describes “image processing path processes an input image in a wavelet domain”. Further, Berkner et al. in column 16 lines 67 to column 17 line 2 describes “noise may be added in the wavelet domain and may be done so that different amounts of noise are added to different bands”. In contrast, amended independent claims 1, 7, and 8 now recite “wherein the said noise comprises spectral components that are in a part of a frequency spectrum that is above the Nyquist frequency of the first image and wherein the image conversion unit comprises a spatial enhancement filter for enhancing structures of an intermediate image which is based on the first image and which has the second resolution”. Support for this can be found in paras [0033] and [0041] and claim 6 of the specification.

Amended independent claims 1, 7, and 8 should thus be found allowable, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 9-10 are also patentable at least because they each depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of independent claims 1 and 8, all of which are patentable as explained above.

For at least the above reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(c) rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-10 be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Berkner et al. (7239424) in view of Avinash et al. (6,592,523).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 6.

Berkner et al. describes “image processing path processes an input image in a wavelet domain”. Avinash et al. describes “improved technique for enhancing discrete pixel ultrasound images which is computationally efficient and which maintains image quality”. FIG. 3 illustrates “highly abstracted rendition of image filtering”. Further, in column 6 lines 64-66 Avinash et al. describes that “The normalized image **74** is filtered to reduce noise via structure mask **76**, thereby creating an intermediate filtered image”. In contrast, current dependent claim 6 recites “spatial enhancement filter for enhancing structures of an intermediate image”. Support for this can be found in para [0033].

Claim 6 is patentable at least because it depends directly from independent claim 1, which is patentable as explained above.

Applicant respectfully asserts that a combination of Berkner et al. and Avinash et al. references fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because, the cited references in combination fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant’s invention.

For the above reasons, claim 6 should be found allowable over Berkner et al. and Avinash et al. references and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections and/or rejections of record, allow all the pending claims 1-10, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerard De Haan

By their Representatives,

Global IP Services, PLLC,
198F, 27th Cross, 3rd Block
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011
INDIA

Telephone in the US: (603)-888-7958



Date: August 16, 2008

By _____

Prakash Nama
(Reg. No 44,255)

(603)-888-7958